

OCT 26 2006

- 5 -

REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on August 08, 2006. Claims 22-33 are standing for examination. Claims 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shelton et al. (US 5,951,643) hereinafter Shelton, in view of Bauersfield et al. (US 6,195,679) hereinafter Bauersfield, and further in view of Bryant (US 6,286,046) hereinafter Bryant.

Applicant has, again, carefully studied the prior art references cited and applied by the Examiner in this case, and the Examiner's rejections and statements of the instant Office Action. In response, applicant herein argues that the art presented by the Examiner, either singly or in combination fails to teach applicant's invention, as claimed. No amendments are made to the claims.

Regarding claims 22 and 28 the Examiner states that; "Shelton discloses the limitation of a session recording mechanism operable by a first user for recording user Web navigation and interaction activity required for data collection associated with a manual navigation and interaction sequence (Fig. 2, combination of WTS Gateway and applets)."

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of Shelton. Shelton teaches a system for Web page data synchronization between a master computer terminal and a plurality of secondary terminals. The system downloads a Web page from a URL entered by a user on the master terminal, sends the Web page matching the URL to WTS server which opens a socket allowing the secondary terminals to view the same page. If the master terminal makes changes to data fields on the page, the WTS server detects the changes and broadcasts the changes to the plurality of secondary terminals. Shelton is only capable of detecting and storing a URL of a Web page downloaded by the master terminal, downloads the page and makes changes to specific data fields wherein the Web page is controlled by the enterprise, and has embedded applets to detect data changes in said fields to synchronize with the WTS server (col. 18, lines 62-65; col. 19, lines 3-12; col. 20, lines 50-62).

- 6 -

Applicant claims recording user Web navigation and interaction activity required for data collection associated with a manual navigation and interaction sequence. Shelton does not record user activity as claimed. Shelton keeps a history of URLs navigated to as is common in browser technology and tracks data fields on those pages for changes. Applicant argues this capability of Shelton cannot read on recording *user interaction activity as claimed*.

The Examiner states that; "Shelton fails to disclose interactions comprising a plurality of web sites. However, Bauersfeld discloses a similar system recording actions made by a web browser user during a browsing session (Col. 3, lines 23-49; suggests multiple web sites are visited). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shelton and Bauersfeld as both inventions relate to recording and playing back web-browsing sessions. Adding the teaching of Bauersfeld provides the benefit of recording and playing back sessions wherein multiple web sites are visited.

Applicant argues that Bauersfeld provides a system to merely manipulate the visited Web page history (URLs) of a browser session. The user marks pages for saving, priority, etc. so at a later time the user can easily navigate back to a Web page or series of Web pages previously visited in a specific order if desired. Applicant argues there is no automatic navigation taking place and certainly no recording of user activity on pages taking place. Whether the URL of one page is stored, or a series is inconsequential to applicant's claimed invention of recording user Web navigation and interaction activity required for data collection associated with a manual navigation and interaction sequence.

The Examiner states that; "Shelton fails to particularly disclose the limitation of a file creation module for converting operations recorded in the manual sequence into an executable sequence of instructions for conducting an automated sequence. However, Bauersfeld discloses a session navigation and recording system that generates session paths which can be executed by a user to replay a previous navigation to quickly get back to content (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Shelton and Bauersfeld as both inventions relate to recording and playing back web-browsing sessions. Adding the teaching of

- 7 -

Bauersfeld provides the benefit of recording navigation steps and converting those steps into a form, which can be selected and played back at a later time by others."

Applicant argues that Bauersfeld provides a system to merely manipulate the visited Web page history (URLs) of a browser session. The user marks pages for saving, priority, etc. so at a later time the user can easily navigate back to a Web page or series of Web pages previously visited in a specific order if desired. Applicant argues there is no automatic navigation taking place and certainly no recording of user activity on pages taking place. Therefore, there is no suggestion or motivation to create a file module for converting operations recorded in a manual sequence into an executable sequence of instructions for conducting an automated sequence. In Bauersfeld, the user navigates through the stored URL sequences manually.

The Examiner states; "Shelton discloses the limitation wherein the system follows the manual sequence, creates the automated sequence, and performs the automated sequence on behalf of the second user at least once after creation, including logging in to individual ones of the sites on behalf of the second user using the login information for the second user, and storing and aggregating data collected in the automated sequence and transmitting the aggregated data to the second user (Col. 18, line 26 to Col. 20, line 50). Applicant argues this statement is completely unfounded and not taught in the art of Shelton. Shelton keeps a history of URLs navigated to as is common in browser technology and tracks data fields on those pages for changes via embedded applets on the Web page. User activity on the pages is not recorded and duplicated in an automatic navigation sequence as claimed in applicant's invention.

Applicant points out that the Examiner has yet to produce valid art against applicant's claims in this 7th round of prosecution. Applicant believes continually finding new art which fails to read on applicant's invention provides an unnecessary burden on applicant.

Independent claims 22 and 28 are clearly and unarguably patentable over the art provided by the Examiner, either singly or in combination, as evidenced by applicant's arguments provided above. Dependent claims 23-27 and 29-33 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

- 8 -

As all of the claims have been shown to be patentable over the art as amended and argued above, applicant respectfully requests that this application be reconsidered, the rejections be withdrawn, and that the case be passed quickly to issue.

If any fees are due beyond fees paid with this amendment, authorization is made to deduct those fees from deposit account 50-0534. If any time extension is needed beyond any extension requested with this amendment, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully Submitted,
Sam Khavari et al.

By Donald R. Boys
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency
3 Hangar Way, Suite D
Watsonville, CA 95076
831-768-1755